

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 100 Nassau Street, New York. Editor: Walter Dill Scott. Business Manager: F. A. Suter. Treasurer: Adolphus. Address: Tribune Building, 155 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:—By Mail, Foreign Post, outside of Greater New York: Daily and Sunday, 1 mo., \$3.00; 3 mos., \$8.00; 6 mos., \$15.00; 1 year, \$28.00. Daily and Sunday, 1 mo., \$1.50; 3 mos., \$4.00; 6 mos., \$7.50; 1 year, \$14.00. Sunday only, 1 mo., \$1.00; 3 mos., \$2.50; 6 mos., \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.

FOREIGN RATES:—DAILY AND SUNDAY: One month, \$4.00; 3 months, \$11.00; 6 months, \$20.00; 1 year, \$36.00. SUNDAY ONLY: One month, \$2.00; 3 months, \$5.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 1 year, \$16.00. DAILY ONLY: One month, \$2.00; 3 months, \$5.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 1 year, \$16.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction result in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Bring Villa to Justice!

Killing Americans has long been a pastime in Mexico. The Bryan-Wilson policy of imploring Americans to flee from Mexico for their lives, of censuring them if they remained in that country to protect their property interests, of dodging the duty of protecting them when living and of avenging them when dead, has borne its perfect fruit.

Every faction chief in Mexico, every ex-bandit and desperado posing as a political or military leader, every peon in the ranks or marauding on his own account, has learned how trivial an offense he commits in taking the life of an American. The value of American citizenship in Mexico is as depreciated as is the value of Villa currency peddled on the street corners of this city.

So far as the protection which nationality gives is concerned, a Guatemalan, a Cuban, a Haytian or a Chinaman is better off in Mexico than is a citizen of the United States.

The supply of Americans in Mexico to be sacrificed to Mexican lust for murder has latterly been falling off. The murderers are being forced more and more to hunt new victims on this side of the border. They have killed and wounded many Americans by firing across the international line. At Naco, Ariz., Villa's soldiers ran up a casualty list of between 50 and 60 before they yielded to requests from Washington to aim their rifles in another direction. Various small invasions of Texas have occurred, all involving bloodshed. Now comes the dastardly night attack on Columbus, N. M., in which General Villa himself is reported to have taken part.

Little or nothing has been done by the Administration to reestablish respect in Mexico for American life or property. Occasionally a small indemnity has been secured, as in the case of an American killed by Zapatistas in the City of Mexico while defending his home against pillage. But for the most part only perfunctory protests have been filed. If any serious idea of exacting adequate reparation was ever entertained, it was abandoned as involving too much discomfort and exertion.

The seventeen Americans massacred at Santa Ysabel, Chihuahua, a couple of months ago have almost passed from memory both in Washington and at the headquarters of General Carranza, who is supposed (according to the fictions of diplomacy) to be earnestly endeavoring to arrest and punish their murderers.

It is time to put an end to this shameful farce of enforcing American rights against Mexican assassins. Killing Americans on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande simply because they are Americans is a breach of treaty. Killing Americans on this side of the Rio Grande by organized bodies of Mexicans is an act of war. If Villa's troops have invaded the United States to vent a grudge against our government for recognizing Carranza, the military and civil organization which he represents has made war on this country. He does not recognize Carranza's authority, nor is Carranza in a position to control him politically or to suppress his murderous activities. The only remedy left to the United States is to enter the territory in which Villa is operating and which he claims to control and to deal with him and his followers as open enemies.

By his attack on Columbus Villa has forfeited all claim to protection from the Carranza government, all right of recognition as a Mexican national. He is either a revolutionist maintaining a government of his own, hostile to that of Carranza, or he is an international outlaw—a criminal without a country.

There is no reason why the United States should not send its armed forces across the Rio Grande to capture and destroy this pillager and cutthroat. We have had in the past agreements with Mexico permitting us to enter Mexican territory in pursuit of bandits and marauders. Carranza may be perfectly willing to waive all objection to the employment of United States troops on Mexican soil, since it is to his interest as well as ours that Villa's career shall be terminated. But whether he consents or not the United States would have ample justification for crossing the border and hunting the Villistas down in their hiding places.

Nothing short of a demonstration of force can now restore American prestige in Mexico and undeceive the lawless elements there as to the value our government sets on the lives of its citizens. The Administration has evaded a duty that America long enough. If our flag, our escutcheon and our diplomacy are to mean anything again south of the Rio Grande

Villa and his followers must be rounded up by our troops and made to pay the penalty of their hideous crimes against American citizens.

Up to Senator Brown.

Either Senator Brown's mysterious moves at Albany mean that he is using his power as Republican leader to strangle the woman suffrage amendment in committee or that he and those who stand with him are subjecting the suffragists to a futile, irritating variety of hazing by delaying action on their measure. Neither supposition casts any credit on the majority leader. Neither course is fair to the suffragists, nor particularly safe for those engaged in the undertaking.

The suffrage issue has long passed the stage where fun can be poked at it, where legislators can afford to cast it aside as trivial, where familiar parliamentary tricks can be used to smother it. If Senator Brown, the leader of a great party's representation in the upper house of the Legislature, does not understand that, it is time he woke up. There were more than half a million votes cast for equal suffrage in the recent election by men who deemed it a great and vital matter. Many of these voters consider it so important that they are willing to put this issue ahead of any local questions, party loyalty or the qualifications of individual candidates for office. No wise party representative would think for a moment of needlessly antagonizing these voters.

Why the delay by the Senate Judiciary Committee? Senator Brown, who apparently is the sole cause, can end it. If he wishes to clear himself of accusations of petty spite, of malice, and worse, of using his party power and position to fight a measure he personally opposes, he will promptly take steps to bring the suffrage amendment to a vote in the Judiciary Committee and see that every facility is given for a fair discussion and early vote by the full Senate.

His present course can only result in arousing bitterness against himself, his colleagues and the Republican party in a year in which no candidate, nor that party itself, can afford to throw away a single vote.

Heed New York's Demand!

The mass meeting at Carnegie Hall tonight to discuss Mayor Mitchell's legislative programme for reducing this city's taxes represents a strong and vigorous demand for relief from unfortunate conditions which only legislative action can remedy. In that demand all classes in the community unite. Not only property owners are concerned. Every business man, every renter, is affected by the fact that the city now pays money for services and improvements which are not directly beneficial to the metropolis. They are unjustly taxed to the extent that money collected in general taxation, of which the city justly should have a share, is spent without any apportionment for New York.

There is evidence on the part of the Legislature a disposition to enact measures which will help the city in some degree. The city demands, and is entitled to have, help in the highest degree which the wisdom of the local officials and the legislators can write into specific statutes. Several of the local legislators have pledged themselves to support all the bills favored by the Mayor; others have pledged a qualified support.

There is bound to be some difference of opinion over the merits of any proposal when it is reduced to the form of statutory verbiage. Over the merit of the general proposal there is no room for doubt. New York has been overburdened and must have relief. On that all the lawmakers elected from this city can agree. Having agreed on that, there ought to be no practical difficulty in their agreeing on a pretty comprehensive programme for legislative action.

New York expects them to do this. The city demands help, and the demand will be vigorous and sustained. No legislator from the metropolis will do his duty to his constituents if he fails to give his utmost support to that demand.

Conditions in Our Dairies.

A resolution was lately introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the appointment of a committee "to investigate and report as speedily as practicable (a) whether conditions prevailing in dairies and dairy products seriously menace the health and property of the people of the United States; (b) whether Federal inspection and supervision, either alone or in cooperation with state and municipal inspection and supervision, are necessary to the reasonable protection of the health and property of the citizens of the United States; (c) if so, then the best and most economic methods of inaugurating and enforcing such inspection and supervision."

As to the reality of the menace, it is hardly to be disputed. The results of an inquiry by the Bureau of Animal Industry have been quoted by the author of the resolution, Mr. Linthicum, of Maryland, and they show clearly enough that a very large proportion of the creameries throughout the country are grossly insanitary and unclean. Thus it is alleged that more than 61 per cent of the cream consumed is contaminated or decomposed or both, that nearly 73 per cent "is not pasteurized, but is made into butter to be consumed in a raw state," and that a considerable number of all dairy cattle—the percentage not estimated—are diseased. It is hardly necessary to point out that as dairy products are the most widely used of all human foods so they may be the most dangerous vehicles for the transmission of infectious diseases. The necessity for effective supervision is, therefore, sufficiently obvious.

We in New York are much better off than the consumers of most other cities. The supervision of dairy products has grown more and more exacting in recent years and there is not the slightest doubt that, in spite of violent opposition to every

new measure for insuring a pure supply, many useful reforms have been effected. But even here the difficulties are obvious. A great deal of our milk and butter comes from other states where the laws are laxer and the impossibility of securing perfect conditions at the source has led to makeshifts. It is true that more rigid rules with regard to pasteurization have accomplished much, but the conditions even now are not wholly satisfactory.

Sooner or later it is probable that the question of Federal supervision will have to be considered. Everything is apparently tending that way and possibly it offers the only reasonable solution. Be that as it may, an inquiry into the present state of the milk supply might be of service if only to secure a clear idea of a problem that must sooner or later be dealt with more effectively than it is dealt with to-day.

What the Public Should Pay.

The decision of the soft coal miners and their employers to compromise their differences rather than to undergo a long and costly strike is eminently sensible. Under the agreement reached the workers will gain certain advantages in higher wages and working conditions to which they are well entitled. These will increase the cost of production of the coal, which increase, of course, will be passed along to the consumers.

If only that increase be passed along, the public will have no legitimate ground for protest. The selling price of any commodity ought to be enough to cover wages and cost of working conditions adequate to meet present-day living costs and conceptions of social justice. The trouble has been, in the past, that what was passed along to the consumers included not only the increased cost but an increased percentage of profit for the employers. It is to be hoped that the operators in the bituminous field and their colleagues who produce anthracite coal, now confronted by a similar demand from their miners, will see the business wisdom, as well as the justice, of abstaining from this method of bleeding the public.

More German Logic.

In attempting to justify the German method of conducting submarine warfare, some one described as a "competent German authority" makes a most heroic effort to wriggle out of the German Prize Code published in the summer of 1914. It is not true, he tells the Overseas News Agency, that the code countenances the arming of merchant ships. It seems to do so only because it provides that the crews of such ships must be treated as prisoners of war. His explanation is that "this is done in order that the crew will not be made to suffer because of obedience to instructions in violation of law which are issued by superiors." In other words, it is merely an example of that gentleness and magnanimity so conspicuous in German warfare.

There is another paragraph in the code that is a little troublesome. It provides that "if an armed hostile merchantman offers armed resistance against measures regulated by prize law, resistance must be broken by all means." The other belligerents accept this of course, but it does fit in well with the new German assumption that armed traders have no recognized status. It seems rather to accept armed resistance as something to be expected. The argument of the competent German authority is that inasmuch as resistance "must be broken" resistance must be wrong, and inasmuch as resistance is wrong Germany cannot recognize it as right, and inasmuch as Germany cannot recognize it as right it is clearly absurd to say the "right of resistance" is "conceded" in Germany's rules, no matter what the rules seem to say.

That is the argument implied in the competent German authority's exposition of the German code, and it is perhaps as potent and convincing an argument as could be made under circumstances so manifestly difficult.

Mr. Baker, our new Secretary of War, believes in the "proper enforcement of power by force, if necessary." So far he seems to be in accord with all the belligerents.

An Old Family Quarrel.

The Supreme Court of the United States will adjudicate the controversy between Vermont and New Hampshire, rendering for these states a service similar to that which years ago it performed for Alabama and Georgia and for Maryland and West Virginia. One state may not sue another without permission of the nation's highest court. Not long ago the Green Mountain State obtained the requisite right to sue the Granite State over the boundary argument which has caused many vexing and some serious differences between them. New Hampshire says the boundary is at the top of the western bank of the dividing river; Vermont claims it is at the thread of the channel.

Into the strip between these lines a workman fell from a bridge. Did he fall into Vermont or New Hampshire? No one knew. The damage suit was settled out of court and the boundary issue continued. Mills stand upon the disputed strip and both states claim the taxes. One large concern has a big deposit in a Vermont bank held in the name of the Vermont bank, but outside of the bank's records no one knows where the money is. The controversy even had much to do with the rejection of Vermont's application for admission to the family of states under the old Articles of Confederation. In 1839 and again in 1913 the states failed to reach an agreement, and the latter failure leads now to this effort to settle the question for good and all.

The Marseilles-Rhone Canal.

Completion of the fifty-mile Marseilles-Rhone canal, which will permit small Mediterranean steamers to enter the Rhone River, indicates that not quite all of France's energy is being consumed by the war. A four and a half mile tunnel through the Rove mountains, the canal's chief obstacle, has been successfully bored, practically ending the six years of labor put in on this great public work. Unlike the Turkish railroads in Palestine, this project seems to have been pushed to a conclusion in spite of the war rather than because of it. Yet its advantages were huge armies are depending on water-borne munitions and food can readily be grasped. To the French canal system, already the most extensive in the world, it will be an addition of prime importance.

A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Give Military Training and Build Up American Ideals There.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: When an assassin fired his bullet into Theodore Roosevelt at Milwaukee it did not deter Colonel Roosevelt from making the speech that he was prepared to deliver. No power on earth could have indicated to Theodore Roosevelt at that hour whether he would live to complete his address. He was there to make that speech, and he made it.

That is the type of man that this country needs in this great hour of crisis to guide, direct and mould its destiny.

It is apparent that the present Administration will not secure to the people of this country either an efficient army or an efficient navy. If we get into the war we will have to depend upon unsystematized volunteer effort on the part of the country at large.

It would seem impossible, in view of the natural antagonism of a free people to a military establishment, that we should ever have universal military service. But may we not secure, in a practical, systematic way, military security along lines of democratic simplicity, in this way?

Under our Constitution, may not Congress establish a national university? May not that university become affiliated in a democratic way with every high school, so electing, in the country? May not the national government provide for each high school in the country a military instructor and give to each high school accepting such military instruction a per capita allowance for each scholar year? May not the graduates of these high schools receive free education in the national university of a broad and comprehensive character, yet building upon the military training initiated in the high school? May not this university be established in some central state, like Missouri, in the midst of hills and forests and away from city life? May it not be so munificently, nationally endowed as to draw to its bosom the best spirit in American life?

Would this not be the true scheme for the creation and perpetuation of American ideals?

There cannot be a shadow of doubt that we have permitted and encouraged alien immigration more rapidly than it was possible for assimilation. There is not a shadow of doubt that our politicians have used these alien masses for corrupt, sordid and selfish purposes.

The hope of the American nation is in securing some system that will bend the youth of the nation away from material, sensual and profligate living and incline the youth of the nation toward the spiritual, the moral, the upright, the sublime.

M. L. MALEVINSKY.
New York, March 2, 1916.

Rearranging International Law.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It is said that the English merchantman has a right to carry guns and yet at the same time to be treated as a peaceful ship. He has such right as against us (a neutral), but has he that right as against Germany, with whom the English nation is at war?

Let us see how the thing (both guns and notice) would work from the English standpoint. The submarine comes to the surface near the armed merchantman, hails him and notifies him that he has one-half hour to escape in his lifeboat. Now it is up to the merchantman to do one of two things, either escape or open fire (of course, he can't do both, for then all his people would be in danger of destruction from the submarine).

If he avails himself of the notice and takes to his lifeboats he doesn't need his guns. If he uses his guns he isn't entitled to the notice, for if so entitled the German, by giving the notice, is simply presenting himself as a target to the English merchantman's guns. In short, the guns on the merchantman and the notice by the German are inconsistent. If the guns are carried the notice should not be expected. And if the notice is required for an honest purpose—viz., to enable the people to escape (the only purpose for which the notice can honestly be required)—then the guns are unnecessary.

They can't require the notice for one purpose and use it for another, ostensibly to enable them to escape, and yet, when the pinch comes, they are to do as they then choose, escape or open fire, and the German is not to know which? There is no question of expediency or of honor or of abatement of right here involved. It is simply the question whether an armed English merchantman is entitled to notice of proposed attack by a German submarine, the two nations being at war with each other; and according as this question is decided certain results follow.

T. YOUNG.
Huntington, N. Y., Feb. 25, 1916.

A "Save America Campaign."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is there any reason why the newspapers of America should not start a "Save America Campaign"? By this I mean for the newspapers of the United States to suggest that all Americans form a union, whose sole purpose shall be "to prevent the possibility of the United States from becoming embroiled in this frightful war by refraining from sailing on any armed vessel at this time. This in no sense a savor of a "warning," but simply a suggestion that the people of the United States unite and stand shoulder to shoulder in an endeavor to prevent thousands of our men from being sacrificed, to say nothing of sparing the anguish of the mothers, wives, sisters, etc.

Surely every American who loves his or her country would be willing to cooperate in this. If you think there is a particle of merit in this will you not give it all the publicity possible?

R. M. GIBSON.
Philadelphia, Penn., March 7, 1916.

The d'Arc Family.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I notice in your report of the shirt-waist strike you speak of the "Jeanes d'Arc," and I should like to inquire if that is the correct plural. If it is, should you not also say the Johns Smith, the Susans Brown, etc.? The English would say the Miss Browns, when we say the Misses Brown, but outside of The Tribune I have not observed the form of plural it uses. I don't know what is correct, I freely confess, and would like to be informed.

L. J. W.
New York, March 7, 1916.

Unauthorized.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In regard to the communication of the chairman of the Senior Council which appeared in your paper of Monday, March 6, I beg leave to state that "The Daily Princetonian" has given leave to no one to make announcement of its opinion concerning the summer camp plan of General Wood.

JOHN S. NICHOLAS, Chairman.
Princeton, N. J., March 7, 1916.

THE LAND PIRATE.



ARMED TRADERS AND PRIVATEERS

The Case of the Kronprinz Wilhelm Considered in the Light of Germany's Plea—Need for Armament Shown To Be as Great Now as in Former Naval Wars.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The distinction between merchant vessels armed for offense and those armed for defense has been practically illustrated in the respective cases of the Mowee and the Appam. It will be recalled that the Mowee, with two heavy batteries of 8-inch guns, overtook the Appam, which was armed with but two 3-inch guns, and that the difference in armament was sufficient to induce the Appam to surrender without resistance. The Mowee in turn gave practical illustration of the manner in which a merchant ship may be captured in accordance with international law by achieving the capture of the Appam without murder.

The Mowee's conduct in the premises established another point—namely, that vessels which are capable of conducting cruiser warfare in accordance with international law are likely to live up to those rules laid down for them. The Mowee, who will recall, was large enough to hold a prize crew to be placed on board the Appam, and large enough even to have taken over the passengers and crew of the Appam had the exigencies of warfare made it necessary for her to sink her prize. When the actual experience of modern warfare, as conducted by one vessel of the German navy, so manifestly establishes the lawlessness of the Germans' use of the submarine, it is a waste of time to argue the matter hypothetically.

There is another aspect, however, of the case of the Mowee type of armed vessels which shows that the law allowing the arming of merchant vessels for defense is not obsolete, but has applications entirely warranted by the developments of present-day war. Nor are these developments of very recent date. I have in mind a case belonging to the earliest phase of the war, the case of the German privateer Kronprinz Wilhelm.

The Kronprinz Wilhelm arrived in the Port of New York prior to the outbreak of hostilities. The Treasury authorities allowed her to sail from New York two days after Germany had declared war upon Russia and some six hours after the delivery of Germany's declaration of war against France had been published in New York and Washington. She did not sail with the same "peace" crew with which she came in, but with a special war crew recruited on American territory from among members of the German Naval Reserve in this port. She sailed, giving her destination as Bremen, but with three times as much coal on board as she could possibly need for the voyage mentioned in her clearance papers. Representatives of the press wrote accounts which were published in the early afternoon, at the same time that Germany's declaration of war against France was published, telling how they had been excluded from the dock to which the ship was tied just as long cases, which they took to contain guns, were being placed on board.

In the early evening I sought to reach the Collector of the Port of New York, was unable to do so, but spoke to the special Deputy Collector. I told him that, acting purely as a citizen, I requested that the Kronprinz be detained pending an investigation of the errand upon which she was about to sail. He replied to me that the Collector of the Port had already made such investigation and had entirely satisfied himself that the Kronprinz was not sailing upon any mission hostile to the nations with which Germany was at war. The next day I read in the newspapers that the "investigation" consisted in taking the affidavit of the captain of the Kronprinz that he had no arms on board and that Bremen was his bona fide destination.

It is now undisputed that the Kronprinz went out under instructions to get in touch with the German cruiser Karlsruhe and be governed by the directions of the captain of that warship; also that she actually met the Karlsruhe on the high seas and transferred

to her a large quantity of coal and thereupon hoisted the German naval ensign and proceeded upon commerce raiding operations; that she thereafter sank a number of ships, including the French liner Guadeloupe, after which she sought and obtained the protection of this government at Norfolk, Va., where, instead of being libeled and her officers and crew arrested, as they should have been, to answer for the conspiracy against the United States in furtherance of which she sailed from New York under false clearance papers, she was allowed to intern and the "marble" of her officers accepted, which I understand most of them have since broken. Hence, I say advisedly that the Kronprinz was a "privateer."

Recent dispatches have intimated that other German commerce destroyers are now on the high seas which left neutral ports as neutral merchant vessels, their case being only to the extent of such use of a neutral flag more flagrant than that of the Kronprinz Wilhelm. Since, however, Germany, in defiance of treaties and of modern international law, has actually used privateers in this war she has thereby taken the very ground from under the feet of those of her apologists who in Congress and out of Congress have urged that the rule in favor of the defensive arming of merchant vessels in one which ceased to have reason for existence since the disappearance of privateers.

But their arguments overlook another fact so striking that its lesson has been driven home to the whole civilized world—namely, that in view of the murders perpetrated by their use the Teutonic submarines have revived another old classification of vessels belonging to the days of lawless warfare, that of the Corsairs. How else are they to be described after the record of the last year? It seems, therefore, begging the whole question to say that the conditions which led to the arming for defense of merchant vessels no longer exist, when as a matter of fact they do exist in aggravated form.

But, as shown by Senators Lodge and Sterling, the rule since its origin has been extended to the point where long prior to this war it was generally recognized as lawful for a merchant vessel to resist capture, even by a regularly commissioned war vessel operating in accordance with the law of nations, using for the purpose her defensive armament; and that neither the possession of such armament nor the instructions for its use, but only actual resistance to capture after a request to stop, justifies an attack by a warship against a merchant vessel. It is in order to avoid risk which was ever inherent to warfare that the Germans would seek to change the law of nations in that regard.

MAURICE LEON.
New York, March 6, 1916.

"Another Buchanan."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The letter in The Tribune of to-day under the above caption reminds me of a little incident that occurred near the close of President Buchanan's term of office. There was a pretty squally outlook at this time, as everybody knows. I was a college student then, and on starting out one morning to a recitation I met an elderly Irishman on the street. He was a stranger to me, but he stopped me and made inquiries about the state of the country. I explained to him as well as I could, and he concluded the interview by saying: "Well, Mr. Buchanan is just like my mother—no man at all."

C. H. RIGGS.
Bristol, Conn., March 4, 1916.

An Indorsement.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to heartily indorse the movement of the merchants to keep factory business out of Thirty-third Street, where rents are low and lofts are available. With the transit facilities soon to be in operation this section will be practically as available as the other. In addition to this it will be a help not only to the property owners but to the city.

HERBERT A. SHERMAN.
New York, March 6, 1916.

THE POLITICAL PAY TABLE

How It Affects Affairs at West Point and Annapolis.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The signing of the bill to increase the number of cadets in the Naval Academy at Annapolis from 1,200 to 1,700 is gratifying but it is to be regretted that no change was made in the method of appointment. The system of selection of the material out of which to make officers upon whose ability to conduct the fate of the nation may one day turn there is a fatal defect.

A system providing that all of the material out of which the government is to make army and navy officers must pass through a political gateway is inherently bad.

While many of those holding the power to distribute their recommendations (which are equivalent to appointments) with full consciousness of the responsibility involved, there are also many Senators and Congressmen who give little heed to the fortunes of the country, but instead use the power of selection to pay political debts. A double waste ensues—a waste of money on the part of the government in carrying on the academies for a year or perhaps longer, and in whom failure is inevitable; a waste of opportunity to get the right kind of men because under the plan of political preferment the most able youth in a Congress district may have absolutely no chance to get either to West Point or to Annapolis, he being no "friend at court."

The ordinary records of the two academies reveal the defects of the system: At West Point about 33 per cent of the cadets drop out. At Annapolis in ordinary times about 18 per cent of the midshipmen drop out during the first year and 26 per cent drop out during the four years' course. These figures do not, however, include the recent upsurge at Annapolis, resulting in the failure of approximately eighty men of all four classes, though the average percentage required in the course of study was only 62.5 per cent. But the appointment of a cadet, not even with his failure. The powerful political lobby that puts a young man into either academy may often be raised to keep him there after he has been tried and found wanting. At times a 25-cent telegram may set all the machinery of a vast political organization in motion to save a failure from dismissal.

It has been estimated, unofficially, that it costs the government upward of \$10,000 to give a cadet in either West Point or Annapolis his course of four years. An estimate of \$12,000 was thought high. Assuming, however, that the four years' course costs not more than a course in Harvard or Yale, it is still too valuable a thing to be left to the exigencies of politics. The waste of money that ensues is the lesser of the two evils attached; the weakening of the army and navy is the greater evil, for the weakness extends beyond the men themselves into the ranks.

These appointments belong to the whole people, and the doors of the two academies should be open to the young men in each Congress district and in each territory who are competitive examinations have demonstrated that they are all others are best fitted.

Recognizing their responsibility to the right of every young man to appointment, some Congressmen have selected their candidates by holding public examinations, but the law governing appointment should be changed that every official holding the power to recommend should follow this rule. Such a course would bring out the very best material in each district, would stimulate the ambition of many youths, would free the academies from the burden of deadwood, and when unexpected vacancies did occur, there would be available a list of men of known ability from which to make selection.

A few years hence the boys now in West Point and in Annapolis will be in charge of not only the disbursements of vast sums of property aggregating millions, but the war will be charged with various grave responsibilities wherein failure may bring about widespread disaster. Is it not high time that we withdrew a matter of such tremendous importance from the political pay table and restored this right of selection for service to the people themselves?

HENRY A. WISE WOOD.
Chairman Conference Committee on National Preparedness.
New York, March 1, 1916.